REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 17 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, on page 4, lines 24-26; page 5, lines 14-16; page 6, lines 19-21; and Fig. 4. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Paula in the November 1, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1 and 8 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

I. §102(e) Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-13, 17 and 18

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Ma et al. (Ma), U.S. Patent No. 6,909,805. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ma fails to disclose or suggest (1) annotations identifying lesser portions of text to be extracted from machine generated text of the original image of the document, and a processing device for determining the lesser portions of text of the document identified by the annotations to be extracted; (2) extracting only the lesser portions of text from the machine generated text identified by the detected annotations; (3) generating a summary including only the lesser portions of text from the machine generated text of the document, the summary being a condensed version of the machine generated text of the original image of the document; and (4) the summary being generated as a separate electronic image document that is different from the original image, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

With respect to (1), Ma teaches a method 10 for detecting and separating add-on handwritten annotations from a scanned document image 50 having printed text lines 52 and

handwritten annotations 54 (Figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 12-18). The method of Ma detects and separates the printed text lines 52 from the handwritten annotations 54 by eliminating all the printed text lines 52 from the scanned document image 50 irrespective of the location of handwritten annotations 54 (Fig. 1, steps 24 and 26; col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 5; col. 5, lines 64-66; col. 7, lines 53-61; Figs. 7 and 8). Thus, the method of Ma does not identify lesser portions of text to be extracted from the printed text lines 52 of the scanned document image 50. Nor does Ma discriminate between extracting the portions of printed text lines 52 that correspond to the handwritten annotations 54 and the portions of printed text lines 52 that do not correspond to the handwritten annotations 54. Therefore, Ma fails to disclose or suggest the claimed processing device or method determining which lesser portions of text are extracted from the machine generated text of the original image of the document based on identification by the annotations.

With respect to (2), in Ma all of the printed text lines 52 are removed from the scanned document image 50 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 5; col. 7, lines 53-61; Figs. 7 and 8), as discussed above. In an attempt to show that Ma discloses extracting only the lesser portions of the original image of the document, the Office Action asserts, on page 8, that Ma "teaches the extraction of annotations made to the margin of a document, and save all the annotations together on memory" (emphasis added) and that therefore "the annotations made to the document before it was scanned are extracted from the document, thereby only extracting the annotations and not the whole document" (emphasis added). However, claims 1 and 8 clearly recite extracting only the lesser portions of text from the machine generated text. Therefore, Ma fails to disclose or suggest extracting only the lesser portions of text from the machine generated text identified by the detected annotations, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Moreover, because Ma teaches detecting and separating the printed text lines 52 from the handwritten annotations 54 by eliminating all the printed text lines 52 without discrimination, and irrespective of, the handwritten annotations (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 5; col. 7, lines 53-61; Figs. 7 and 8), as discussed above, Ma clearly fails to disclose or suggest extracting only the lesser portions of text from the machine generated text the original image of the document based on identification by the detected annotations, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

With respect to (3) Ma teaches that after extraction from the document image, all the printed text lines 52 may be saved into a memory (col. 7, lines 52-61). However, Ma does not disclose or suggest that the memory only includes the extracted lesser portions of text from the machine generated text of the document, or that the summary is a condensed version of the machine generated text of the original image of the document. Instead, the entire original image of the document may be saved into a memory. Accordingly, Ma is unable to allow only important or relevant sections of the original document image designated by the handwritten annotations to be compiled as a summary of the original image of the document, which is a benefit of the combinations of features recited in claims 1 and 8.

With respect to (4), Ma only teaches that the printed text lines 52 may be saved into a memory (col. 7, lines 52-61), as discussed above. Ma does not teach that the printed text lines 52 are subsequently output to form a separate electronic image document. Moreover, because all the printed text lines 52 (the entire original image of the document) are saved into a memory, as discussed above, Ma also fails to teach that any separate electronic image document would be different from the original image. Therefore, Ma fails to disclose or suggest the summary being generated as a separate electronic image document that is different from the original image, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Thus, claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Ma. Because claims 2-6, 9-13, 17 and 18 incorporate the features of claims 1 and 8, these claims also are patentable over Ma. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

II. §103(a) Rejections of Claims 7 and 14-16

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ma in view of Kurosawa et al. (Kurosawa), U.S. Patent No. 6,751,779; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ma in view of Kupiec, U.S. Patent No. 6,533,822. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action acknowledges that Ma fails to disclose a summary comprising hidden portions which are selectively expandable to increase the information in that portion of the summary, as recited in claims 7 and 14. However, the Office Action alleges that such feature is disclosed by Kupiec.

Kupiec teaches generating a summary sheet 72 with indicators 84 that indicate the corresponding locations in the document from which summary portions were extracted (Fig. 4; Abstract; col. 1, lines 36-60). The indicators 84 indicate page and line numbers (col. 1, lines 46-48) and allow a user to access corresponding portions of the document that are related to the summary 76 by directly accessing the original document using the information indicated by the indicator 84 (Figs. 4 and 5; col. 1, lines 54-58). The indicators 84 have corresponding tabs 86 positioned on the margin of the summary sheet 72 which indicate the vertical position of the extracted portion in the summarized document 70 that correspond to the indicators 84 as well as navigation information (Figs. 4 and 5; col. 7, lines 3-7 and 13-17). Thus, by clicking on a tab 86, the user is able to visit corresponding portions the original document. However, these portions are not selectively expandable. They are not manipulated further once the user clicks on the tab 86 and is directed to the portion. Thus,

Kupiec does disclose or suggest providing a summary comprising hidden portions, each portion selectively expandable to increase the information in that portion of the summary, as recited in claims 7 and 14.

Further, each of Kupiec and Kurosawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ma with respect to claims 1 and 8. Thus, claims 7 and 14-16, which incorporate the features of claims 1 and 8, are patentable over the combination of Ma and Kupiec for this reason as well. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

III. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 19 and 20

The Office Action rejects claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ma in view of Lerner et al. (Lerner), U.S. Patent No. 6,859,909. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lerner fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ma with respect to claims 1 and 8. Thus, claims 19 and 20, which respectively incorporate the features of claims 1 and 8, are patentable over the combination of Ma and Lerner. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David R. Kemeny
Registration No. 57,241

JAO:DRK/kxs

Date: November 8, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461